# **Chapter 5** California Environmental Quality Act Evaluation

## 5.1 Determining Significance Under CEQA

Whereas Chapters 3 and 4 of this Final EIS/R addressed environmental impacts for the proposed project primarily according to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), this chapter discusses the significance of environmental impacts for the proposed project according to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Determination of significance under NEPA regulations involves consideration of context (setting) and intensity of the impact. The context to be considered may include society as a whole (human, national), the affected region, the affected interests, or the locality. Short and long term effects are relevant, though NEPA does not require individual significant effects to be specifically identified in an EIS. For a site-specific action, such as the proposed interchange reconstruction project, significance would depend upon the effects upon the affected region or locale.

CEQA requires specific significant impacts to be determined in an EIR. Determination of significance under CEQA guidelines begins by eliminating impacts that are obviously insignificant. Those impacts whose significance is uncertain or potentially significant undergo studies. The studies determine if the impacts result in substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. A social or economic change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant. CEQA requires substantial evidence—"facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts"—in determining significance. Serious public controversy over the environmental effects of a project shall, however, be treated as an indicator of significance.

Additionally, CEQA distinguishes four mandatory findings of significance:

1. potential to substantially degrade the environment, reduce the habitat of a fish and wildlife species, cause fish or wildlife populations to drop

below self-sustaining levels, threaten or eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory

- 2. potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals
- 3. environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable
- 4. environmental effects will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly

#### 5.2 CEQA Environmental Checklist

The following checklist identifies physical, biological, social, and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. The CEQA impact levels include potentially significant impact, less than significant impact with mitigation, less than significant impact, and no impact.

Chapter 5 California Environmental Quality Act Evaluation					
	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact	
<b>AESTHETICS -</b> Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway?				X	
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		X			
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X		
<b>AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</b> - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X	
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X	
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X	
<b>AIR QUALITY -</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X	

Chapter 5 California Environmental Quality Act Evaluation					
	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X		
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X		
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentration?			X		
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X	
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X	
C) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		X			
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X	

Chapter 5 Ca	alifornia Environmental Quality Act Evaluation			
	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
COMMUNITY RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a) Cause disruption of orderly planned development?				X
b) Be inconsistent with a Coastal Zone Management Plan?				X
c) Affect life-styles, or neighborhood character or stability?			X	
d) Physically divide an established community?				X
e) Affect minority, low-income, elderly, disabled, transit-dependent, or other specific interest group?				X
f) Affect employment, industry, or commerce, or require the displacement of businesses or farms?				X
g) Affect property values or the local tax base?			X	
h) Affect any community facilities (including medical, educational, scientific, or religious institutions, ceremonial sites or sacred shrines?				X
i) Result in alterations to waterborne, rail, or air traffic?				X
j) Support large commercial or residential development?				X
k) Affect wild or scenic rivers or natural landmarks?				X
l) Result in substantial impacts associated with construction activities (e.g., noise, dust, temporary drainage, traffic detours, and temporary access, etc.)?		X		

Less than Potentially significant Less than significant significant impact with No impact mitigation impact impact **CULTURAL RESOURCES -** Would the project: a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? **GEOLOGY AND SOILS -** Would the project: a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv) Landslides? b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Chapter 5 California Environmental Quality Act Evaluation

Chapter 5 California Environmental Quality Act Evaluation Less than Potentially significant Less than significant impact with significant No mitigation impact impact impact d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating Χ substantial risks to life or property. e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -Would the project: a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Chapter 5 California Environmental Quality Act Evaluation

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

Chapter 5 California Environmental Quality Act Evaluation Less than significant Less than Potentially significant impact with significant No impact mitigation impact impact **LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:** a) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the X project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? b) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project: a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? b) Result in the loss of availability of a locallyimportant mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? **NOISE -** Would the project: a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Chapter 5 California Environmental Quality Act Evaluation				
	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
<b>POPULATION AND HOUSING -</b> Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	
PUBLIC SERVICES -				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?				X
Police protection?				X
Schools?				X
Parks?				X
Other public facilities?				X

Chapter 5 California Environmental Quality Act Evaluation Less than Potentially significant Less than significant impact with significant No impact mitigation impact impact **RECREATION** a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project: a) Cause an increase in traffic which his substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in X location that results in substantial safety risks? d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incomplete uses (e.g., farm equipment)? e) Result in inadequate emergency access? f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project: a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Chapter 5 California Environmental Quality Act Evaluation					
	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact	
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X	
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X	
e) Result in determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X	
MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -					
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, or cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X	
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X		
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X		

### 5.3 Discussion of CEQA Checklist Responses

In the CEQA checklist in Section 5.2, only the following items were noted as "Potentially Significant Impact" and "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated."

#### **Aesthetics** – Would the project:

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings

Some elements of the proposed project's Preferred Alternative—flyover connectors, Route 92/I-880 separation structure, sound walls, and combination retaining walls/sound walls—are higher than the connectors, structures, and houses that they replace. These elements are a concern to people in the surrounding neighborhoods. They worry that the proposed project degrades views, reduces the value of their properties, and starts a decline in the character and upkeep of their neighborhoods.

#### **Biological Resources** – Would the project:

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means

Construction of footings, foundations, and other elements of the I-880/Route 92 interchange facilities results in displacement of approximately 0.3 acres of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers jurisdictional wetlands.

#### **Community Resources** – Would the project:

1) Result in substantial impacts associated with construction activities (e.g., noise, dust, temporary drainage, traffic detours, and temporary access, etc.

Construction activities for the proposed project involve vegetation removal, excavation, grading, pile driving, demolition, building material transport, dirt and material removal, trucking, and more. These construction activities generate noise and dust. They require temporary access of private properties (construction easements), lane closures on the freeway (off-peak period), and traffic slowdowns and detours associated with the replacement of the

Calaroga Avenue overcrossing. Although construction of the proposed project occurs from within the freeway right-of-way, some trucks may have to use local streets

#### Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the project:

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or environment?

The top 0.52 m (6 inches) of soil in unpaved areas of the project site has lead concentrations that are above thresholds deemed by California regulations to be hazardous. Excavation or disturbance of this soil would pose hazards to construction workers, the public, and the environment if no safety and health precautions are taken.

#### **Noise** – Would the project:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies
- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project
- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project

Driving piles for the new Route 92/I-880 separation structure requires lane closures on I-880, which are only allowed at night. Consequently, temporary and periodic increases in noise above ambient levels and in excess of the local ordinance will occur on a few nights.

Ambient noise levels in the project area are related to traffic on I-880, Route 92, and the existing I-880/Route 92 interchange. Some locations along Route 92 are projected to have noise levels above the FHWA criteria (peak hour L<sub>eq</sub> approaching 67 dBA) for noise abatement.

#### **Transportation/Traffic** – Would the project:

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

To construct a sound wall west of I-880 and adjacent to Route 92 westbound, an area currently used for parking at a condominium complex and a church may be needed.

# 5.4 Mitigation Measures for Potentially Significant Impacts Under CEQA

The following are proposed mitigation measures only for the impacts discussed in Section 5.3. Mitigation measures for joint NEPA/CEQA impacts—water quality, storm water runoff, air quality, energy, ambient traffic noise, vegetation, traffic transportation, and historical/archaeological resources—are in Chapter 3.

Aesthetics – To lessen visual effects, the proposed project relies on berms, landscaping, and architectural treatments (lines/forms, colors, textures) of structures and walls. Visual impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods would be mitigated in a number of ways. Sound walls constructed along residential areas would provide some visual screening of the interchange structure. The architectural characteristics of the sound walls would include features (e.g. colors and textures) that would lessen the visual impact of the walls to the extent feasible. Where sufficient space is available on the shoulders of I-880 and Route 92, plantings would be added to screen and soften the appearance of the walls. New berms would also lessen the visual impact of interchange components. Landscaping would include use of fast growing evergreen trees to maximize screening effect.

**Biological Resources** – The wetlands affected by the proposed project are to be replaced on-site, in the southeast quadrant of the interchange, at ratio of 2:1. In comparison to the existing wetlands, the new wetland will be away from the edge of pavement, and have better wetland qualities.

Community Resources – The impact of construction upon the community are to be addressed through a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) that is prepared with input from the City of Hayward and residents in the surrounding neighborhood. The TMP includes measures to minimize circulation, air quality, noise, hazardous waste, and safety impacts. The TMP discusses public notification and outreach throughout construction of the proposed project, monitoring of impacts and mitigation measures, regular

meetings with the City of Hayward and the public to receive feedback on mitigation of impacts, and contacts to register complaints. Sound walls will be among the first elements of the proposed project to be constructed and would attenuate noise associated with the construction of subsequent elements.

Hazardous Waste/Materials – The construction contract Special Provisions for the proposed project would include specifications pertaining to the excavation, handling, transport, and disposal of soil and ground water deemed to be hazardous. The construction contract Special Provisions would also required the construction contractor to have a health and safety plan, prepared by a certified industrial hygienist, and enforceable by the Caltrans Resident Engineer, to minimize exposure of workers and the public to hazardous materials, and to prevent the spread of hazardous materials from the construction site.

**Noise** – Construction noise is to be addressed in the TMP as discussed under community resources. Predicted increases in ambient traffic noise levels are to be abated with new and modified sound walls. The sound wall locations and heights are provided in Section 3.5.4.

**Transportation and Traffic** – The temporary loss of parking at the condominium complex and church may be averted through a realignment of the proposed retaining wall along Route 92 westbound. Another alternative may be to use the parking areas for construction activities only between 8:00 AM and 4:00 PM.